DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 107 182 HE 006 564

TITLE	The Role of Research at the University of San Francisco: A Report to the President.
INSTITUTION	San Francisco Univ., Calif.
PUB DATE	30 May 75
NOTE	50p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.76 HC-$1.95 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS	*Attitudes; Faculty; Faculty Evaluation; *Financial Support; Grants; *Higher Education; *Orientation; *Research; Space Utilization; Tables (Data)
IDENTIFIERS	*University of San Francisco

ABSTRACT

The committee of research at the University of San Francisco recognizes that teaching is the primary responsibility and objective of this university. The committee views instruction and research as activities that can be interrelated and mutually enriching within the academic enterprise. It is within this spirit that the current study is presented. This document contains the following: (1) an historical and funding background of the university committee on research; (2) a brief history of research at the university; (3) an attitudinal survey of the university academic officers' view of the role of research in this university; (4) a delineation of the research funding pattern in the university; and (5) a description of the available noninstructional laboratory space. Specific committee recommendations as to purpose, structure, funding, and future directions are presented. (Author/KE)

ED107182

University of San Francisco
Office of Institutional Studies

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

San Francisco, California 94117

THE ROLE OF RESEARCH AT THE UNIVERSITY OF SAN FRANCISCO

Prepared by

University Senate Committee on Research

ED107182

THE UNIVERSITY OF SAN FRANCISCO

University Senate Committee on Research

THE ROLE OF RESEARCH AT THE UNIVERSITY OF SAN FRANCISCO: A REPORT TO THE PRESIDENT

Prepared by

The Committee

San Francisco, California 94117

May 30, 1975

UNIVERSITY OF SAN FRANCISCO

COMMITTEE ON RESEARCH

The Reverend William C. McInnes, S.J.,
President
University Center 401
University of San Francisco

Dear Father President:

In his letter of May 10, 1974, Provost Seidl, at your request, enlisted the aid of the University Committee on Research in the following manner:

> I would like to ask the Faculty Research Committee to recommend a policy statement and a program of implementation for the future research direction of the University.

In special meetings in May and September, Provost Seidl offered the full cooperation of the University Administrative Offices and encouraged the Committee to examine as completely as possible the role of research at the University.

This report, the result of almost a full-year of effort, presents what, in the opinion of the Committee, is the most accurate appraisal obtainable from available records and faculty and administrative input of research activities at the University. The Committee has sought diligently to include all pertinent information, whether supportive or non-supportive of its own views. The Committee has refrained from an intense analysis or interpretation of the information in a conscious effort to permit the President an unencumbered opportunity to engagge in these endeavors. It is our collective and unanimous opinion, however, that research activity is a vital factor in the academic life of the faculty of any institution of higher learning which sees as its goal the advancement of human knowledge and experience.

It is our hope that this report will provide sufficient information to facilitate an increased awareness and enhancement of the role of research as an important factor in the future life of the University of San Francisco.

Respectfully submitted,

David A. Mullen,
Chairman

DAM:nw
encl.

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA 94117

THE UNIVERSITY SENATE COMMITTEE ON RESEARCH

Eugene V. Benton, Ph.D.	Physics
James Steve Counelis, Ph.D.	Education
Arthur Furst, Ph.D.	Chemistry
Hamilton Hess, D.Phil.	Theology
Nicholas Imperato, Ph.D.	Business Administration
W. Michael Mathes, Ph.D.	History
David A. Mullen, Ph.D. Chairman	Biology
Robert A. Wolf, Ph.D.	Mathematics

ABSTRACT

At the behest of the President and Provost, the University Senate Committee on Research prepared this report. It contains the following: (1) an historical and funding background of the University Committee on Research; (2) a brief history of research at the University; (3) an attitudinal survey of the University academic officers' views on the role of research in this University; (4) a delineation of the research funding pattern in the University; (5) a description of the available non-instructional laboratory space. Specific Committee recommendations as to purpose, structure, funding and future directions are presented.

PERSPECTIVE

The Committee on Research recognizes that teaching is the primary responsibility and objective of this University. The Committee views instruction and research as activities which can be interrelated and mutually enriching within the academic enterprise. It is within this spirit that the current study is presented.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
The University Senate Committee on Research	ii
Abstract	iii
Perspective	iv
Text	1
Appendix:	
(1) University of San Francisco Committee on Research: Handbook Statement on Research	33
(2) Academic Officers' Questionnaire .	34
(3) Mailing List for Academic Officers' Questionnaire	35
(4) The Academic Officers' Questionnaire Responses	36
Tables:	
(1) Table No. 1: The University Faculty Research Grants Distribution, FY 1966-1967 to FY 1974-1975	6
(2) Table No. 2: The University Faculty Research Grants Program, Distribution by School/Department, FY 1966-1967 to FY 1974-1975	7
(3) Table No. 3: University Faculty Publications, FY 1967-1968 to FY 1972-1973	12
(4) Table No. 4: Faculty Activities: Current and Ideal Rankings by University Academic Officers . . .	14

Page

(5) Table No. 5: University Research Grant and Contract Funding, FY 1971-1972 to FY 1974-1975* 16

(6) Table No. 6: University Grants and Contracts, FY 1974-1975 . . . 18

(7) Table No. 7: University Non-Instructional Laboratory Space Distribution by Department, Spring 1975 20

(8) Table No. 8: University Non-instructional Laboratory Space, Spring 1975 21

THE ROLE OF RESEARCH AT THE UNIVERSITY OF SAN FRANCISCO: A REPORT TO THE PRESIDENT

by

The University Senate Committee on Research

I

The Committee on Research

The Committee on Research was established as a standing committee of the University Senate in 1961. The new committee prepared and approved its "Research Statutes" or working by-laws on April 14, 1961 and submitted them for approval to the Academic Vice-President on May 4, 1961. In these statutes, under the heading GENERAL POLICY, the Committee offered a "Definition of Research" and sought to define also the "Attitude of the Institution Towards Research." Under the heading ADMINISTRATION OF RESEARCH, the Committee defined the functions of the institution and its administrative officers in the encouragement and support of worthy research and included its own role in these endeavors.

The principle functions of the committee were contained in the following general categories of expected activity contained in its statutes:

1. The Committee shall engage in a continuous study of research in the University and shall formulate and implement research policies.

2. The Committee shall strive in every way to encourage and stimulate research among the faculty by providing as much information as possible concerning opportunities and means of financial support of original research.

3. The Committee shall make grants for research from the special

budget for this purpose which is to be administered by the Committee in accordance with policies which it shall adopt.

What appears to have been the first meeting of this Committee took place on October 18, 1966. The intervening five years from the establishment by the Senate were evidently non-productive in the three categories of activity listed above. This first active Committee, chaired by Dr. Arthur Furst, had as members Dr. Donald Brandon, Fr. Robert Burns, S.J., Dr. Joan Green, Dr. James Haag, Mr. Thomas Jordan, Dr. William Litzinger, and Dr. Robert Schooley. The Committee established and published its by-laws and "Guidelines for Grant Applications" and recommended a series of small faculty grants from a newly budgeted source of funds made available by the University. They also established a subcommittee to seek outside funding to support research at the University.

In AY 1967-68, Dr. Brandon resigned from the Committee and was replaced by Dr. S. Koeppen. Aside from reviewing faculty grant requests and awarding grants this Committee revised and updated the "Grant Application Guidelines" and published a "Statement of Principle for a Committee of Associates." This latter Committee was to oversee all research at the University which utilized human subjects to ensure their safety and human rights. The members of the Committee on Research automatically became members of this second committee.

In AY 1968-69, Dr. Otto Plaat joined the Committee replacing Dr. Koeppen and Mr. Jordan left the Committee, reducing its membership to six. The funding of worthy research projects occupied all of the time of this small Committee.

The membership changed substantially in AY 1969-70 to include Dr. Jefferson Davis, Dr. David Mullen, Mr. Robert Stock, and Fr. James Brennan, S.J. Dr. Joan Green served as acting chairperson. Aside from reviewing grant applications, the Committee met several times to examine the role of research at USF and the functions of the Committee in facilitating that role. This effort was the most serious to that date in the performance of the Committees' function of studying research at the University.

The following year, AY 1970-71, the Committee was expanded to nine members with the return of Dr. Furst and the addition of Dr. Eugene Benton, Dr. James Counelis, Dr. W. Michael Mathes, Dr. Robert Cunningham, and Dr. William Baker. Again, the review of grant proposals occupied most of the efforts of the Committee but the Committee also sent out a questionnaire to all grant recipients to attempt to determine their use of and professional gains from grants provided. The procedures by which the Committee reviews grant applications were again revised and the role of research at the University was reviewed. The Committee also completed a study of research funds needs and requested a modest increase in University funds for grants.

In AY 1971-72, a significant change in direction occurred as a result of an increase to $5000 in the faculty research budget and the placement of greater emphasis on the advisory role of the Committee in research policy. The Committee responded to many requests for advice from the administration.

The chairmanship changed again in AY 1972-73 as Dr. Green took a leave of absence and was replaced by Dr. Mullen. Dr. Nicholas Imparato replaced Dr. Baker as a member of the Committee. The survey of grant recipients was continued and the Committee addressed its main efforts to a revision of its "Guidelines for Grant Applications" and the allocation of most of its grant budget.

The following year, two new members, Dr. Hamilton Hess and Dr. Robert Wolf were appointed to replace Dr. Cunningham and Dr. Green. In this year of general University administrative change and financial difficulties, the Committee was not chartered until late in the fall semester and the faculty grants budget was cut to only $3000. The Committee reviewed applications, awarded the grants, and then turned its full attention to a study of its role in policy decisions involving research at the University. The results of this self-examination opened discussions with University administration regarding the future of research at the University and the formation of a newly proposed administrative OFFICE OF RESEARCH. After several meetings with Provost Anthony E. Seidl, the Committee was asked to prepare a complete study of the history of research at the University, make its assessment of the role and value of research at the University, and finally to make recommendations for the future administration of research at the University. This review was to be completed as soon as possible to serve as a guideline for administrative decision-making in the area of research.

In AY 1974-75, research funds were increased to the previous

$5000 level and the unallocated funds from prior years were replaced into the faculty grants budget. The Committee membership remained unchanged and a greatly expanded work load was directed toward a revision of the new Faculty Handbook "Policy Statement on Research" and descriptions of the Committee on Research and Committee of Associates, the review and award of faculty research grants and the preparation of this first comprehensive "Report to the President" on the role of research at the University.

The information presented in the following tables summarizes the principal work of the Committee in awarding grants to faculty projects. Aside from this function, the information may also serve as a basis for discussion of the research effort and needs within this university community. It is important to point out that the small size of most faculty research grants (average about $320) makes them undesirable for many researchers; and applications may have been discouraged in some departments where "seed money" is not suitable for their research programs.

Without attempting to analyze thoroughly these data, a task which is often overdone and leads to little additional insight, the following observations can be made regarding some trends.

1. It is obvious that the demand for funds exceeds significantly their availability.

2. With the exception of AY 1973-74, there has been a steady increase in demand for research funds. The demand in the exceptional year was greatly reduced because of the difficulties of administrative transition which delayed Committee action until very late in the year.

3. While the use of faculty grants is heavier in some departments than in others, there is a healthy balance in applications and grant awards between the science and non-science departments.

TABLE NO. 1: THE UNIVERSITY FACULTY RESEARCH GRANTS DISTRIBUTION, FY 1966-1967 TO FY 1974-1975

YEAR	UNIVERSITY FACULTY RESEARCH BUDGET	TOTAL FUNDS REQUESTED [APPLICATIONS]	TOTAL FUNDS AWARDED [SUCCESSFUL APPLICATIONS]
1974-75	$ 8,100*	$14,377 [12]	$ 6,762 [10]
1973-74	3,000	5,979 [16]	3,212** [10]
1972-73	5,000	9,063 [19]	4,260 [13]
1971-72	5,000	8,665 [16]	4,410 [13]
1970-71	3,000	8,888 [14]	2,995 [10]
1969-70	3,000	7,006 [19]	3,303** [12]
1968-69	3,000	4,075 [12]	3,250** [12]
1967-68	3,000	6,711 [20]	3,300 [15]
1966-67	3,000	3,354 [11]	2,508 [9]
TOTALS	$36,100	$68,118 [139]	$34,000 [104]

* Figure includes $2,000 not allocated in 1973-74 budget and $1,100 not awarded in 1972-73.

** Figures include unused awards returned from previous years applicants.

TABLE NO. 2: THE UNIVERSITY FACULTY RESEARCH GRANTS PROGRAM, DISTRIBUTION BY SCHOOL/DEPARTMENT, FY 1966-1967 TO FY 1974-1975

SCHOOL/DEPARTMENT	APPLICATIONS		TOTAL FUNDS AWARDED
	SUCCESSFUL	TOTAL	
Biology*	24	28	$10,630
History	12	13	2,590
Education	9	11	3,323
Economics	9	10	2,365
Psychology*	9	10	2.206
Sociology	8	11	2,528
Chemistry*	8	10	2,717
Physics*	5	6	1,740
English	4	7	1,195
Mathematics*	4	5	768
Business Administration	3	3	343
Computer Science*	2	4	1,015
Philosophy	1	5	340
Theology	1	4	300
Government	1	3	250
Communication Arts	1	2	365
Ethnic Studies	1	2	900
Nursing*	1	2	260
Anthropology	1	1	150
Physical Education	0	2	0
Total	104	139	$33,985

*Sciences: 53 Applications = $19,336
Non-Sciences: 51 Applications $14,649

With the exception of research publication figures listed in the following section, data representing the application of information derived from the research efforts funded so far by the University are difficult to collect and assess and are very incomplete as yet in this relatively short-lived program. Grants are only "seed money" designed to initiate research "pilot studies" so that the researcher can seek more substantial funding from federal, state, and private sources. Many researchers have done this and projects thus initiated are still in progress. Completion and publication of other projects has occurred in many cases and the number of published works has begun to increase markedly in recent years (five published papers filed with the Committee in 1974-75) as earlier work is completed and publishing "lag time" passes.

A comparison of the commitment in funds and time provided to faculty by the University with those of most other universities indicates that this program is indeed meager as compared with programs in other small private schools such as Fordham University where faculty grants from the university regularly exceed $500,000 annually.

This history of the University Senate Committee on Research is presented in some detail to demonstrate the shifting emphasis in the functions of this Committee from one of simply reviewing grant applications toward its present role as an advisory council to the administration on all aspects of research at the University. The Committee believes that this shift is essential if research is to be encouraged in a more meaningful way at this University. The brief existence of this Committee and its very limited functions do not seem worthy of an institution dedicated to scholarly

advancement for its students and faculty.

History of Academic Research at the University

Few documentary sources exist for the construction of a history of academic research at the University, and there are no departmental, school, college, or University policy statements regarding research other than that contained in the Faculty Handbook. It is clear from the limited documentation available and from interviews with selected faculty members who have served the University over a long period of time that the University administration has expected its faculty to engage in research but that it has done little to encourage such research apart from making it a criterion for faculty hiring and an incentive for promotion.

University hiring practices have tended to give preference to persons who have done research and publication or who have presented papers at professional conferences. Advancement in rank has tended to be awarded to those who have demonstrated professional excellence by research and publication and rapid advancement has been wholly dependent upon it. The Faculty Handbook (edition of 1965, p. 60) reflects this policy in Appendix B. It states concerning criteria for promotion, "Professional Service or competence, as well as outstanding University service, may offset a limited amount of activity in research or the creative arts."

The University has failed for the most part to provide other incentives or supports for research activity on the part of its faculty. Funding for research projects proposed by faculty members has been meager,

and when distributed among each year's applicants it has been supportive only of small projects or projects of low expense, or has functioned as "seed money" for projects which can be funded from sources outside the University. Research assistants, secretarial service, and other aids have not normally been provided by the University to those engaged in research. The research which has been done has been pursued through individual initiative and resourcefulness and, frequently, in the face of indifference on the part of the administration. There has been no effective University policy for the reduction of teaching loads or committee assignments to facilitate research.

Research and publication by faculty has not been publicized extensively by the administration nor has it been employed as a means of attracting students or public interest in the University. The accomplishments of many well-known scholars have been virtually ignored on their own campus by administration and students. No active inquiry regarding faculty research and publication has been conducted until the recent past. Furthermore, the administration has failed to treat research in a qualitative manner. For this reason, little differentiation has been made between research publication as a new and original contribution to human knowledge and popular lectures, innovative teaching, textbook publication, and the translation or re-editing of previously published research.

Research and publication by those faculty who have engaged in it on a regular basis has been of generally equivalent quantity and quality as the work produced at institutions that are more research oriented. Research

scholarship however, has not been a strong point among the faculty of this University.

Research at the University of San Francisco has been conducted by a relatively small proportion of its faculty members. The following table presents data relating to published research scholarship by faculty members of the grade of instructor and above in the College of Arts and Science from 1967 to 1973. No slight to any other college or school within the University is intended. The data is given on the basis of its availability for Arts and Science. Data for the first five years is taken from annual surveys conducted by the Dean of the College of Arts and Science. That for the year 1972-73 is from the report Faculty Professionalism Beyond the Classroom by Dr. James S. Counelis, published by the University Office of Institutional Studies.

It is seen that the number of faculty members producing published research increased during these years roughly in proportion to the progressive increase in the total number of faculty. It is also seen that the proportion of the faculty engaged in research remained constant at about 25%. This is a low percentage, and the relative lack of scholarly productivity at the University during these sample years is shown even more clearly by the fact that a significant proportion of the faculty members who engaged in research during the six years did so consistently and produced a substantial amount of the work that was done. Five faculty members published during all six of the sample years; six published five years out of the six; seven published four years out of the six; and seventeen published three years out of the six.

TABLE NO. 3: UNIVERSITY FACULTY PUBLICATIONS, FY 1967-1968 TO FY 1972-1973

YEAR	PUBLICATIONS		PUBLISHING FACULTY	UNIVERSITY FACULTY
	BOOKS	ARTICLES		
1967-68	18	58	32	107
1968-69	10	63	33	126
1969-70	11	70	40	151
1970-71	10	63	40	163
1971-72	26	112	41	155
1972-73	12	85	42	156

Attitudes of Current Academic Officers

A questionnaire was sent to 29 University academic officers in order to survey the present attitudes and preferences regarding research. Fourteen replies were received, 10 from department chairmen. A copy of the questionnaire, a list of those to whom the questionnaire was sent and a list of the responses to each of the four questions appear in Appendix. A summary of the responses to each of the four questions follows:

(1) From your perspective as a faculty member and as a university academic officer, please define the term "research."

General Summary: Generally, research was viewed as a systematic investigation of some problem within the researcher's area of interest.

(2) Does a report or paper have to be published in order to be described as "research?" Please indicate what you mean by the term "publish."

General Summary: There was a wide discrepancy of opinion on whether or not a report or paper has to be published in order to be described as research. There is agreement that a project's results should be communicated and disseminated.

(3) From your perspective as a faculty member and university academic officer, please rank "Instruction," "Research," "University Service," and "Public Service" both as your departmental faculty members actually behave currently and as you would have them behave ideally. Rank these activities 1 to 4 with 1 as the highest and 4 as the lowest ranks.

General Summary: Nearly all respondents considered instruction as primary to research for the University to meet its objectives.

(4) Please explain the rationale for your "ideal" ranking or ordering of the above faculty activities.

General Summary: Good undergraduate instruction should be the goal of the University. Undergraduate tuition supports the University.

Table 4 contains a summary of responses to this question.

TABLE NO. 4: FACULTY ACTIVITIES: CURRENT AND IDEAL RANKINGS BY UNIVERSITY ACADEMIC OFFICERS

FACULTY ACTIVITIES	CURRENT FACULTY BEHAVIOR		IDEAL FACULTY BEHAVIOR	
	RANK	N*	RANK	N
Instruction	1	12	1	12
	2		2	1
	3	1	3	-
	4	-	4	-
Research	1	1	1	1
	2	6	2	8
	3	4	3	2
	4	2	4	2
University Service	1	-	1	-
	2	7	2	3
	3	6	3	9
	4	-	4	1
Public Service	1	-	1	-
	2	-	2	1
	3	3	3	3
	4	10	4	9

*Only thirteen respondents completed the table.

Research Funding

The committee addressed itself to the general question of the financial impact of research on the University. The important questions include: What is the current level of research funding? Is the level of funding increasing or decreasing? What are the primary sources of funds? How much overhead funds are generated by research? Does research pay for itself? What financial impact will there be to the University if the current level of research is substantially increased or decreased?

A major difficulty in answering these questions arises from the fact that past and current financial records are either poor or non-existent. Also, there are many hidden, or difficult to assess, financial factors in the areas of costs and benefits. For example, it is difficult to assign a cost to research laboratory space which is also used for instructional purposes. At the same time, a piece of research equipment, no matter how expensive, which is turned over to the University is usually not reported as a financial asset.

Because of these difficulties, a truly comprehensive financial statement on research cannot be made by this committee. Nevertheless, we believe that the analysis of the existing data does reveal a definitive financial picture of research at the University.

Table 5 lists the levels of funding for the last four fiscal years. Figures are also included for total direct cost, overhead paid by projects and payment of overruns by the University.

TABLE NO. 5: UNIVERSITY RESEARCH GRANT AND CONTRACT FUNDING, FY 1971-1972 TO FY 1974-1975*

GRANT/CONTRACT FUNDING	FY 1971-1972	FY 1972-1973	FY 1973-1974	FY 1974-1975
Total Direct Cost	$257,299	$364,455	$302,911	$365,865
Overhead	56,032	80,026	83,539	95,040
"Overruns"	2,593	9,671	3,123	1,400
Total Cost	$313,331	$444,481	$386,450	$460,905

*Financial data obtained from the University Office of Business and Finance.

It is observed that for the last four years the level of funding has gradually increased from $310,738 to $459,505 while the overhead contribution has grown from $56,032 to $95,040. We believe that there are principally two reasons for this growth: 1) there has been a substantial growth in Physics Research; and, 2) the Lilly-Drake Cancer Fund was made available to the faculty. It is also noted that the "overruns" on research projects have been and continue to be very small. This statement does not necessarily apply to some of the training grants and other special non-research projects.

The only detailed data that are available are for FY 1974. This is summarized in Table 6. Of the twenty-eight research projects, the great majority are in the sciences and are federally funded. Six projects were funded from the Lilly-Drake Cancer Fund. It is interesting to note that the combined overhead contribution of the Institute of Chemical Biology and Physics Research account for 93.4% of all research overhead paid to the University during FY 1974.

The overhead contribution of $95,040 goes to pay for the University participation, research space, utilities, general grant administration, and other research related costs. It should be noted that, while the overhead of universities fluctuates considerably, the universities' current overhead rate of 61.17% of salary is quite high compared with other institutions.

TABLE NO. 6: UNIVERSITY GRANTS AND CONTRACTS, FY 1974-1975

UNIVERSITY RESEARCH UNIT	PROJECTS	TOTAL FUNDING	OVERHEAD CONTRIBUTION
Institute of Chemical Biology	6	$242,610	$55,761*
University Participation			($39,839)
Physics Research	9	148,396	32,987**
University Participation			($12,499)
Academic Departments	13+	69,899	6,292
Total overhead received			$95,040

* ICB turned over a $5000 refrigerated centrifuge and a $12,000 ultra-centrifuge for use by Drs. Jones, Flessel, and Treagan.

** In addition, during FY 74, Physics Research received $55,937 in equipment.

+Six of these are Lilly-Drake Cancer Fund projects for a total funding of $34,154 and contributing $5696 of overhead.

Noninstructional Laboratory Space

A tabular report of the space occupied at the present time by research laboratories or office laboratories at the University is presented in Appendix II. All of these laboratories, with one exception, are in Harney Science Center, the lone exception being Loyola 14 which is just now being converted into a research laboratory for the Department of Physics. An office laboratory is a laboratory space which is part of a faculty member's office. Instructional laboratories were omitted from the survey.

The total amount of space occupied by research laboratories and office laboratories at the University is 1341 sq. meters (= 14,423 sq. ft). Not entirely all of this space is currently being used for research, Harney 309 and 340 being used to some extent as preparation rooms for laboratory instruction in the Department of Biology.

It should be noted that the present report has concerned itself with actively used non-instructional laboratory space alone. Rooms such as McLaren 118 (Observation Lab) which are currently used primarily for instruction were omitted, even though their potential as research space might be exploited in the future. On the other hand, rooms such as Campion D-11 (Psychology Laboratory) which are currently used mostly for research but occasionally for instruction were included. Rooms used merely for storage were not included.

Some other rooms were found underutilized. Harney 516 (15 sq.

TABLE NO. 7: UNIVERSITY NON-INSTRUCTIONAL LABORATORY SPACE DISTRIBUTION BY DEPARTMENT, SPRING 1975

DEPARTMENTAL LABORATORIES	AREA (m^2)	PERCENT
Biology: Research Laboratory	329	
Office Laboratory	160	
	489	35.7
Chemistry: Research Laboratory	260	
Office Laboratory	77	
	337	24.6
ICB: Research Laboratory	347	25.3
Physics: Research Laboratory	157	11.5
Psychology: Research Laboratory	39	2.8
Total	1369	100.0

TABLE NO. 8: UNIVERSITY NONINSTRUCTIONAL LABORATORY SPACE, SPRING 1975

DEPARTMENTAL LABORATORIES	AREA (m^2)
Department of Biology	
1. Research Laboratories	
a. Harney 302	44
b. Laboratory behind Harney 304-305	60
c. Harney 309	91
d. Harney 321	20
e. Harney 336	34
f. Harney 338	25
g. Harney 340	37
h. Harney 507	18
Sub-Total	329 (3550 sq.ft.)
2. Office Laboratories	
a. Harney 307	12
b. Harney 317	12
c. Harney 319	12
d. Harney 323	12
e. Harney 325	12
f. Harney 327	12
g. Harney 344	12
h. Harney 347	12
i. Harney 352	12
j. Harney 355	20
k. Harney 357	12
l. Harney 364	20
Sub-Total	160 (1730 sq.ft.)
Total for Biology = 489 sq. meters (= 5280 sq. ft.)	

TABLE NO. 8: CONTINUED

DEPARTMENTAL LABORATORIES	AREA (m^2)
Department of Chemistry	
1. Research Laboratories	
a. Harney 427-430	117
b. Harney 433	44
c. Harney 436	44
d. Harney 444	44
e. High Pressure Lab.	11
Sub-Total	260 (2810 sq. ft.)
2. Office Laboratories	
a. Harney 407	11
b. Harney 409	11
c. Harney 434	11
d. Harney 437	11
e. Harney 440	11
f. Harney 442	11
g. Harney 448	11
Sub-Total	77 (830 sq. ft.)
Total for Chemistry = 337 sq. meters (=3640 sq. ft.)	

TABLE NO. 8: CONTINUED

DEPARTMENTAL LABORATORIES	AREA (m^2)
Institute of Chemical Biology	
1. Research Laboratories	
a. Harney 354	20
b. Harney 359	12
c. Harney 361	12
d. Harney 447	66
e. Harney 451-452 (one room)	66
f. Harney 501)	18
g. Harney 502)	33
h. Harney 503) mouse colonies	42
i. Harney 504)	33
j. Harney 505)	27
k. Harney 506)	18
Total	347 (3730 sq. ft.)
Department of Physics	
1. Research Laboratories	
a. Harney 134-135-136-137 (one room)	80
b. Harney 141	40
c. Loyola 14	37
Total	157 (1690 sq. ft.)
Department of Psychology	
1. Research Laboratories	
Campion D-11	39
Total	39 (420 sq. ft.)

meters) and Harney 548, 549, 550 (30 sq. meters) are currently used mainly for haphazard storage space by Biology, although Theology uses Harney 548 as a faculty office. Harney 234 (13 sq. meters) serves as a repository for old computer paper, old television sets, assorted college catalogs, and the like. Harney 315 and 350 (at least 12 sq. meters each) are currently used as preparation rooms for Biology and could perhaps be used more for research. The storeroom adjacent to Campion D-13 has 5 sq. meters of space and is utterly vacant. Room A-125 in the basement of Memorial Gymnasium is a huge room of roughly 100 sq. meters which currently houses such miscellany as old chairs, old doors, and firewood.

Undoubtedly, a thorough search by the Committee on Space would turn up other inefficiently used rooms, but it should already be quite obvious that research space beyond the present capacity is available. For example, with some prudent storage, Harney 516 and 548-549-550 could be utilized for active research. It likewise seems that the potential for Memorial Gymnasium's A-125 has not been appreciated at all.

II

RECOMMENDATIONS

University Council on Research and Creativity:

The present Committee on Research should be expanded from 8 to 9 members. These members are to be appointed to staggered three-year terms. Four members of the present Committee on Research should be appointed to one-year terms, two members to two-year terms and three members to three-year terms. The initial appointments should be based on the

recommendations of the Committee on Research in order to provide the continuity needed during the transition period. Thereafter, appointments should be made following recommendations of the Council to maintain the nine-member Council with a balance reflecting participation by the various departments, colleges and schools within the University. Members recommended for less than the full three-year terms should be eligible for reappointment immediately upon completing their terms. Members completing full three-year terms should not be eligible for reappointment for one year.

The Council, in consultation with the University administration, will develop policies of general importance to the development of research and creative efforts by faculty members; (2) adopt and modify its own by-laws; (3) seek support, in the form of grants and gifts from outside agencies, in concert with the Vice President for University Relations; (4) administer all funds and gifts intended for the development and continuation of research and creativity (other than individual or specific institutional grants, contracts or gifts which are donated to the University); (5) advise the administration on questions concerning the development of research and creativity. In these capacities the Council will act as a resource agency to aid administrative officers in carrying out the task of developing and maintaining research and creativity at the University. There are a number of unresolved issues which need immediate attention. Among them is the development of a simplified, uniform University-wide procedure for grant applications.

Council Chairperson

In order to provide the full-time position considered necessary for the chairpersonship of the new Council without the added expense of a new administrative/faculty position, it is suggested that the designated development officer of the Office of the Vice President for University Relations become a member of the Council. The officer could be elected chairperson of the Council and if elected would assume full responsibility for its functions in cooperation with the wishes of the Council and would devote his/her full efforts to this work. If a faculty member of the Council were elected chairperson of the Council, he/she should be released from half of his/her teaching responsibilities and in cooperation with the officer from the Office of Development they could provide the full-time effort considered necessary to carry out the duties of the Council. In order to permit the scheduling of teaching and/or administrative work loads, it is suggested that the chairperson be elected one full year prior to assuming office. It is also suggested that the term of office for the chairperson be two years to increase the efficiency of the office. Continuation in office for the second or any additional years would be after successful review by the Council and the administration. If reelected to office, the chairpersons' membership on the Council would be extended beyond the recommended maximum term of three years.

The chairperson will be a voting member of the council and will carry out the policies developed by the Council in conjunction with the policies of the administration. The duties of the chairperson will include:

1. Administration of the Office of Research and Creativity;

2. Search for outside sources of funding for research and creativity;

3. Acting as the principle liaison officer between the faculty and the administration in matters within the scope of the Council;

4. Initiation and promotion of programs to improve the status of research and creativity at the University by:

a. Publishing a Directory of Research and Scholarship at the University of San Francisco;

b. Sponsoring symposia and colloquia by the University faculty and others;

c. Seeking and sponsoring conventions, meetings, recitals, concerts and exhibitions;

d. Publicizing the scholarly activities of University faculty on campus and in the public media;

e. Acting as a resource person at all University decision-making levels involving the interests of the Council such as:

(1) Budget and planning committees;

(2) Graduate student committee;

(3) Rank and tenure committee;

(4) Space allocation committees;

(5) University priorities committees;

(6) Teaching awards and honors committees;

(7) Sabbatical committee;

(8) Faculty welfare committee;

(9) Any ad hoc or standing committee of the university upon which the Council and Administration feel the Council could be of service.

The function of the Chairperson on each of these committees would be to represent the Council and Administration through suggestions and decisions intended to improve the role of research and creativity at the University. In this capacity, the Chairperson might be accepted as

a member or ex-officio member on many of these committees and thus be able to carry out the wishes of the Council by a vote or at least by direct input at meetings.

Upon review and agreement by the Council and the administration the Chairperson may be re-elected to this administrative/faculty post. The Chairperson would thus occupy a unique and challenging position as an administrative officer who functions jointly at the pleasure of the faculty and the administration. The Council would interact with this person in decision making situations at regularly scheduled meetings. The chairperson would relate administration desires and decisions at these meetings and would be responsible for considerable initiative in developing procedures and securing funds to further the faculty's abilities to engage in research and creativity.

Office of Research and Creativity: Funding:

Although funding for the establishment and operation of the proposed new Office initially must come entirely from within the University, it is hoped that a significant portion will eventually be generated from outside agencies as a result of the efforts of the Council and a vigorous and active Chairperson. The University should allocate a percentage of its total budget for use in the following areas of development.

AREA I: FACULTY DEVELOPMENT

Direct support for faculty research and creativity is to be allocated through the recommendations of the Council in the form of grants to worthy faculty applicants using guidelines similar to those presently used by the University Committee on Research.

In addition to funding of faculty by direct grant, it is suggested that individual faculty be permitted to apply for funds to hire temporary replacements for their teaching duties in order to be freed to engage in research or creative activities either on campus or elsewhere. These funds would be provided on the merit of applications for such activities according to criteria to be established by the Council. These funds are not to be used for sabbatical replacements but only for special "Research or Creative Leaves of Absence."

It is also seen as appropriate under this category of investment that funds be provided for the establishment of special "chairs" for visiting scholars and artists renowned for their contribution in their field. In this way their influence on faculty and students could be brought directly to the University.

Funds should be made available for travel to meetings and conventions to be awarded to faculty submitting meritorious applications for such travel grants.

Funds should also be made available to University scholars for the final preparation of scholarly works for publication (e.g., typing, page charges, plate charges) where these charges are considered appropriate and upon the successful application of a request to the Council.

Finally, it is suggested that special purses or merit awards should be established with funds from this category to provide greater incentive and emphasis to the development of scholars and artists in the University.

AREA II: INSTITUTIONAL DEVELOPMENT

The second major use of funds should be directed toward the enhancement of the image of the University as an active and productive institution of higher learning and research. This could be accomplished in many ways already indicated in Area I but could be more rapidly affected by sponsorship of regional or national society conventions, meeting, and special programs, including the creative arts and the funding of honoraria for speakers. These types of activities should not draw funds from Area I as the University would then become only a "bulletin board" for the display of the productivity of other institutions.

AREA III: PROGRAM ADMINISTRATION

The third area of funding would be for the administration of the new program. These funds would be for logistic support for the

Office of Research and Creativity. The administrative salary of the Chairperson and the salaries of the support personnel, office overhead and travel would be included under this category of funding. We believe that if the initial funding for this program were set at the one per cent level of the University budget (approximately $120,000) a figure suggested to us as a reasonable level of investment by the Provost, the funds should be distributed in the following manner:

During the first year, funds should be evenly distributed as needed between the three areas. In subsequent years there should be a shift in funding into Area I with a de-emphasis on Area II as outside funds are generated. It is anticipated that outside funds will be obtained for significant portions of Area I funding from federal and state grants. This should relieve some pressure from the University budget. In like fashion, outside agencies interested in the sciences, arts and institutional development such as certain philanthropic foundations, may provide significant funding for Area II. Organizations using the University as a center for meetings and conventions will provide funds and this may reduce the contribution necessary for Area II.

Area III should be funded by the University entirely. Funds generated by the Council should be used exclusively for Area I and II.

Committee on Human Subject Rights: Structure and Function:

The present Committee of Associates, which consists of the present membership of the Committee on Research and the Vice President for Academic Affairs, should be replaced by a Committee on Human Subject Rights. The chairperson of the Council should sit on this new Committee as its chairperson. This Committee shall also include two members of the Council, the Vice President for Academic Affairs or his appointed representative, an attorney with special qualifications in the areas of insurance liability and university law and a physician. The minimum membership of this Committee should be five in order to comply with the federal regulations.

The Committee should meet to establish by-laws for its governance and to update these by-laws at least once per year in compliance with federal regulations. The Committee should then meet only as necessary to review the propriety and value of safeguards for human subjects to be used in research proposals prepared by University faculty funded by the University or by outside agencies. Regulation of the actions of this Committee will be in compliance with the Policy on Protection of Human Subjects published by the U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Chapter 1-40, HEW TN 71.6 (4/15/71).

Though it is seen as necessary and appropriate that significant membership on this Committee come from the Council, it is not necessary that this Committee be considered a part of the Council or that it be under the direct guidance of the Council. It is, therefore, to function as an independent Committee rather than a subcommittee. This is seen as a useful "checks and balance" system to ensure that the rights of human subjects will be adequately protected, since the Council might be influenced in its decisions on specific grant proposals by the scientific merit of the proposal rather than by its feelings about the safeguards incorporated for the protection of human subjects.

APPENDIX

UNIVERSITY OF SAN FRANCISCO
COMMITTEE ON RESEARCH

Final draft of Faculty Handbook statement on research to replace section 15.22. With final approval at the 14 October meeting this statement will be forwarded to Father McInnes.

It is the policy of the University of San Francisco that one role of a faculty member is to engage in original efforts to extend human knowledge or human expression. Research is defined as critical investigation, experimentation, or creative activity which accomplishes these extensions. Research is distinguished from personal scholarship, the aim of which is to extend one's own comprehension of knowledge already in existence.

Within the constraints of University facilities and budget, the University of San Francisco sponsors research and encourages faculty participation in externally funded programs. The University views research and instruction as interrelated and mutually enriching activities within the academic enterprise.

While research is not the only criterion, it is an important factor in the consideration of faculty members for promotion in rank.

THE UNIVERSITY OF SAN FRANCISCO
The University Committee on Research

Academic Officers' Questionnaire

Purpose and Directions: Briefly, this questionnaire attempts to survey the attitudes and preferences of the University's academic officers (President, Provost, Vice President for Academic Affairs, Deans, and Academic Department Chairmen) in the area of research on our campus. The Research Committee has been given the responsibility of compiling by May, 1975 a comprehensive report on the role of research in the University. Your cooperation is solicited. If you wish to add further comments, please attach as many pages as you wish. Please return this questionnaire by April 2, 1975 to:

Dr. David A. Mullen, Committee Chairman
Department of Biology
Harney 347

---

1. From your perspective as a faculty member and as a University academic officer, please define the term "research."

2. Does a report or paper have to be published in order to be described as "research"? Please indicate what you mean by the term "publish"?

3. From your perspective as a faculty member and University academic officer, please rank the following faculty activities both as your departmental faculty members actually behave currently and as you would have them behave ideally. Rank these activities 1 to 4 with 1 as the highest and 4 as the lowest ranks.

Faculty Activities	Current Behavior	Ideal Behavior
(a) Instruction	____	____
(b) Research	____	____
(c) University Service	____	____
(d) Public Service	____	____

4. Please explain the rationale for your "ideal" ranking or ordering of the above faculty activities.

- -

Signature

MAILING LIST FOR ACADEMIC OFFICERS' QUESTIONNAIRE

University-wide Administrators

Reverend William C. McInnes, S.J., President
Dr. Anthony E. Seidl, Provost
Dr. Lloyd D. Luckmann, V.P. for Academic Affairs

School/College Administrators

Rev. John H. Martin, S.J., Dean, Graduate Division
Dr. Paul McKoskle, Acting Dean, School of Law
Dr. Jack I. Garvey, Assistant Dean, School of Law
Fr. Cornelius M. Buckley, A.J., Acting Dean, Colleges of Liberal Arts and Science
Dr. Allen Calvin, Dean, School of Education
Fr. Theodore T. Taheny, S.J., Assistant Dean, Colleges of Liberal Arts and Science
Mr. Harold R. Walt, Dean, College of Business Administration
Sr. Mary Geraldine McDonnel, S.M., Dean, School of Nursing
Dr. Joan L. Green, Assistant Dean, School of Nursing
Fr. Robert L. Maloney, S.J., Director, Evening College
Dr. William V. Burgess, Dean, Summer Session and Intersession

Departmental Chairperson

Fr. James J. Dempsey, S.J., Department of Communication Arts
Dr. Frederick A. Breier, Department of Economics
Rev. Edward V. Stackpoole, S.J., Department of English
Dr. Alex Smetana, Department of Government
Dr. Giacinto Matteucig, Department of Modern Languages
Dr. Desmond J. Fitzgerald, Department of Philosophy
Dr. Colin P. Silverthorne, Department of Psychology
Fr. Paul F. Belcher, S.J., Department of Sociology
Fr. Albert J. Zabala, S.J., Department of Theology
Dr. Gary L. Stevens, Department of Biology
Dr. Robert J. Seiwald, Department of Chemistry
Dr. John C. Hoff, Department of Computer Science
Dr. Daniel Gallin, Department of Mathematics
Dr. Raymond J. Genolio, Department of Physics
Dr. Elizabeth G. Gleason, Department of History

THE ACADEMIC OFFICERS' QUESTIONNAIRE RESPONSES

Below are given the responses of the University's academic officers to the four question survey document sent to them to detail their attitudes to research and other faculty activities.

+

1. From your perspective as a faculty member and as a University academic officer, please define the term "research."

(a) An original investigation on some subject of scholarly interest.

(b) Pursuing areas of interest which will eventually benefit the state of the field of endeavor.

(c) Primary research deals with original sources using the proper scientific methodology; secondary research deals with collating, organizing and interpreting the primary research carried on by others. In either case there is need for systematic investigation to establish facts or principles.

(d) . . . . Since "research" is an intervening variable it can't be meaningfully defined in terms of words, but only in terms of operations.

(e) Research is a process, using a well planned approach and appropriate tools, instruments for the purpose of 1) solving a problem; 2) seeking new knowledge or new relationships. As such it may be evaluative or non-evaluative. The nature of research is determined by the goals, not the method.

(f) Careful, systematic study leading to an increase of knowledge.

(g) Critical investigation and analysis of a field of knowledge.

(h) Original contribution to an academic field; original and serious work in a legitimate intellectual discipline.

(i) Process whereby individuals, operating with "approved methodologies" work out "answers" to problems.

(j) To deepen and broaden our knowledge and keep abreast of developments in his area of specialty.

(k) A critical and exhaustive investigation or experimentation.

(l) Investigation of questions within one's discipline either 1) in depth beyond existing work, or 2) from a new perspective.

(m) Research is the scholarly investigation of a problem with the objective of sharing what is learned through one's teaching, lecturing or publication.

(n) A search/examination/investigation for new knowledge, be it in the library, lab, or field.

2. Does a report or paper have to be published in order to be described as "research"? Please indicate what you mean by the term "publish"?

(a) An original investigation on some subject of scholarly interest.

(b) Yes, published in appropriate journal or presented at an appropriate convention.

(c) No, research can be of value to teaching or university service regardless of whether or not it's published. By "published" I would mean it appears in a journal or the equivalent where it would be exposed to criticism by competent scholars.

(d) Significant research is possible without publication. However, publication in a recognized professional journal can provide evaluation and recognition of research by an agent outside the university.

(e) No, the activity is the research. Publication is simply one vehicle for reporting research activity.

(f) It does not have to be published (i.e., in a serious, legitimate scholarly publication), but it had better justify itself if not.

(g) No, not at all.

(h) No, term "publish"? means appearance in print.

(i) No, it does not. In our situation, research is carried out at such a slow pace that the substance of the work is reported elsewhere before it can be finished. The article should appear in a publication abstracted by Chemical Abstracts.

(j) The purists say research is never completed but it has been communicated. But communicated to whom and how? "Publication"

does not mean everything people think it does. I have seen the same "research" publication under ten different titles in as many journals.

(k) Yes, but it can be either printed, circulated to peers within the field in typescript, or delivered orally at a meeting of a specific learned society.

(l) I understand it to mean sharing one's discoveries with others through oral and written communication, i.e., papers read at learned society meetings as well as printed in journals.

(m) No, to publish is to disseminate your expertise in your classes, around table discussions or outside lectures, not necessarily in print.

(n) From where did the criterion originate that research defined include any type of publication? Not in the normal definition of "publish," i.e., appear in a journal, book, etc., but it can still be "research" if not published.

3. From your perspective as a faculty member and university academic officer, please rank the following faculty activities both as your departmental faculty members actually behave currently and as you would have them behave ideally. Rank these activities 1 to 4 with 1 as as the highest and 4 as the lowest ranks.

Faculty Activities	Current Behavior	Ideal Behavior
(a) Instruction	____	____
(b) Research	____	____
(c) University Service	____	____
(d) Public Service	____	____

Table #4 summarizes this question.

4. Please explain the rationale for your "ideal" ranking or ordering of the above faculty activities.

(a) A professor is hired to teach and the student should be his primary concern. To be a good, effective and relevant teacher, one must constantly try to deepen and broaden his knowledge through

extensive reading and particularly to keep abreast of developments in his area of competence or specialty.

University service also has the student as its central concern, plus that of the University. Hence, such activities as close rapport between student and professor, academic and career counseling, chairing a Dept., service on University committees, etc., should be rated highly.

In promotions one should qualify as a good teacher and qualify in one of the other three areas, University service, public service, or published research.

(b) Reality, workload, faculty preparation, money, are internal priorities.

(c) We are primarily an undergraduate instructional institution and almost completely dependent on tuition for support. Research is essential but should rank above instruction only in institutions which can afford both. Service is necessary but not by all faculty members.

(d) Research provides stimulation and helps teaching which is our primary concern. University service is limited in terms of possibilities and is never rewarded. Community service is important and on the rise.

(e) In the present state of affairs of the University the need for building community and for making the University financially solvent has higher priority than research. In fact the very effort to establish a community will enrich the instructional efforts of the entire institution.

(f) In most cases faculty salaries come from the tuition that is paid by students for instruction.

(g) In the professional schools (Education) the goal of public service represents the most effective course of action.

(h) A university needs a vigorous intellectual community. Far too many USF faculty are totally dormant in this regard, and this lack of activity eventually affects their teaching as well.

(i) Research is integral to good instruction and teaching - learning process. It is engaged in various forms.

(j) Most of the departments in Liberal Arts - because of teaching loads and lack of library facilities - are not geared toward "research" according to my definition.

(k) Obviously, USF is a teaching institution - its strong point could be excellent and careful undergraduate instruction.

Equally obvious is the fact that one cannot rely only on second-hand work if one wants to know one's field well.

(l) From my point of view, the "distinctive" aspect of education in which USF can excel is teaching. We cannot compete with Stanford, Berkeley, etc., as researchers, but we can be superior to them in the area of instruction. I would, therefore, favor a policy that emphasized instruction and service, and encouraged research but did not make it a primary priority of the University.

(m) I find it difficult to rank these activities as if they were in competition rather than complimentary. However, I believe we primarily teach and our teaching is enriched by our further learning.

(n) Research should enhance, not replace, instruction at USF. If we really are committed to teaching at USF, the ideal order is logical.